

REMARKS

Claim 38 has been amended and new claims 45-46 have been added. No claims have been canceled by way of this response. Thus, claims 17-20, 23-26, 36, 38-46 are currently pending and presented for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The Examiner has provided only select pages from Epixtech. If the Examiner maintains a rejection based on this reference, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide the full content of this document in order to have complete access to this reference. Likewise, the Examiner has provided only select pages from Gralla. If the Examiner maintains a rejection based on this reference, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide the full content of this document in order to have complete access to this reference.

Response to Rejections Under Section 112:

Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, the Examiner contending that this claim fails to comply with the written description requirement and is not commensurate with paragraph [44] of the instant specification as observed in the PG-Pub. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 40 was previously presented as claim 9 in English translation and as claim 27 in the Preliminary amendment. Applicant amended claim 27 on the June 22, 2007 response and simply moved claim 27 to claim 40 due to Examiner's objections on August 9, 2007 of the claims depending on a forward claim. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that par. [0024] of the Substitute Specification provides adequate support for claim 40. Additionally Applicant has amended the Specification to recite "the most selected information page is displayed at a prioritized or prominent position on the user interface".

Response to Rejections Under Section 101:

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 101, the Examiner contending that this claim is directed towards nonstatutory subject mater. Applicant has amended "arrangement" "web server" "proxy server" and "portal server" to "system" "web server appliance", "proxy server appliance" and "portal server appliance" respectively. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, par. [0033]. An appliance has a physical embodiment and thus is not abstract. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the Section 101 rejections.

Response to Rejections Under Section 102:

Claim 39 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(a), the Examiner contending that this claim is anticipated by Epixtech, "iPAC System Administrator's Guide", 9 Jan 2002, Version 2.0, Epixtech.

Applicant's independent claim 39 recites:

receiving a user data record from the end user, the user data record having features which describe a sought content for determining a web page,

The Examiner indicates that this limitation is found by the "Add to my list", P-1-12. Applicant respectfully submit that Epixtech teaches receiving user data via a user interface accessible via the web (see e.g, pg 1-11) to store information retrieved via a search pertaining to a content of a Library and not for determining a web page. Applicant's independent claim 39 further recites:

the web page includes an address of an associated content data record in a non displayable area of the web page, and the associated content record includes features describing a content on the respective web page and an address of the respective web page;

Applicant's web page includes an address of the content record and the content record includes an address of the web page. Thus there is a cross reference between the content record and the web page.

The Examiner indicates the limitation that the web page includes an address of an associated content record in a non displayable area of the web page is via the hyperlink on P-1-12 "because the address is not displayed on the web page". Applicant respectfully submits P-1-12 shows a web page having the user interface which includes the hyperlink "Shakespear". However, Applicant's user data record is for determining a web page. In contrast, the IPAC's web page (P. 1-12) must be determined prior to entering the user data record since it contains the add to my list button. Therefore IPAC's web page cannot be reasonable interpreted as Applicant's web page.

Furthermore, the Examiner indicates the MARC bib record provides an address to the web page (which has been identified by P. 1-12) and thus meets the limitation of Applicant's associated content record includes ... an address of the respective web page. Applicant respectfully submits that the MARC bib record includes a URL (address) to enable the hyperlink link to display additional information and not the web page on page 1-12.

In view of the above, claim 39 is not anticipated by Epixtech.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Claims 17-20, 23, 24, 36, 38, 41-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims as being obvious over, Epixtech in view of Gralla et al., "How the Internet Works", Dec. 1999, Que, hereinafter Gralla. Claims 40 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a), the Examiner contending that these claims as being obvious over, Epixtech in view of Gralla in view of Raciborski et al. (US PGPub 2001/0051980).

For at least the reasons discussed in connection with the Section 102 rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the Section 103 rejection.

Furthermore, Epixtech teaches a web based interface for searching a library catalog system. The library catalog system being a controlled environment and provided with a user interface in order to search the catalog. Gralla teaches interfacing with the web. The Examiner contends that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Gralla in order to request a web page from the Internet and for a link for the web page to be provided in a portal page of Epixtech. However, the pages displayed by Epixtech are limited by a library catalog database which is searchable by the web. There is no teaching or suggestion by Epixtech to search for any data outside the database used by Epixtech.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Section 103 rejections.

New Claims:

New claims further define the scope of the invention as described in the specification and drawings. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding the other claims, Applicant respectfully submits claims 45-46 are patentable and requests allowance of claims 45-46.


Conclusion

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the objections and rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 02-28-2008

By: _____



Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830